COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

3 4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. Jurisdiction is founded on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 1367.

Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because 12. Defendants reside in, and all incidents, events, and occurrences giving rise to this action occurred in, the County of Los Angeles, California.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

- PLAINTIFF repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 12 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 14. On or about February 16, 2009, PLAINTIFF, who was in custody at Twin Towers Correctional Facility, was beaten without legal justification by DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS.
- Prior to being beaten, one of the DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY 15. SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS said to PLAINTIFF, "I hate French people."
- 16. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS then took PLAINTIFF to a dark room and violently assaulted him with no legal justification.
- DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or 17. CUSTODY ASSISTANTS threw PLAINTIFF into a dark room, beat him on top of his head and in his ribs with their fists and with flashlights, picked him up and dropped him repeatedly to the floor, broke his glasses and threw them out of his reach, slapped him in his ears with the flip flops issued to him by the facility, and then threw him into a holding cell.
 - 18. PLAINTIFF was handcuffed at the time of the assault.

- 19. PLAINTIFF experienced severe pain and suffering, fractured ribs, and bruising all over his body as a result of this assault. PLAINTIFF also suffered humiliation, fear and degradation.
- 20. On information and belief, at the time of the assault, a reasonable officer in the position of DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS would not believe that PLAINTIFF posed an imminent threat to anyone's safety or that he was attempting to flee.
- 21. On information and belief, DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, although having actual and constructive notice and knowledge of PLAINTIFF's serious medical conditions, disregarded his medical needs. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to obtain appropriate medical care for PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF experienced severe pain and suffering.
- 22. On information and belief, DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS intentionally concealed or tampered with evidence, and intimidated witnesses, to cover-up the unreasonable use of force against PLAINTIFF.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unreasonable Search and Seizure and Due Process—Excessive Force and Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(Against Defendants DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS)

23. PLAINTIFF repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

24. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS's unreasonable use of force against PLAINTIFF deprived him of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to the PLAINTIFF under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment,

and further deprived PLAINTIFF of due process as guaranteed to the him under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS knew that failure to treat PLAINTIFF's medical condition could result in further significant injury or the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, but disregarded that serious medical need, causing him great

Defendants DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS,

bodily harm.

25.

26. Defendants' actions thus deprived PLAINTIFF of his right to be free from unreasonable seizures under the Fourth Amendment and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.

27. The conduct of DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS was malicious, oppressive and in reckless disregard for the rights and safety of PLAINTIFF, and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to Defendants DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

2 3

Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of

United States Constitution—Equal Protection

(Against Defendants DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or

5

4

6

7 8

10

11

12

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

26

27

28

PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 27 28. herein, as if set forth in full.

CUSTODY ASSISTANTS)

- Defendant DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or 29. CUSTODY ASSISTANTS's actions were motivated by ethnic or national origin animus and discrimination and this also violated PLAINTIFF's rights under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States.
- Defendant DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or 30. CUSTODY ASSISTANTS's actions were committed with deliberate indifference to PLAINTIFF's constitutional rights and were a direct and legal cause of the deprivation of PLAINTIFF's constitutionally protected right under the Fourteenth Amendment to be free from discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or national origin.
- 31. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these acts of Defendant DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS were willful, malicious, intentional, oppressive, reckless and/or were done in willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of PLAINTIFF, thereby justifying the awarding of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at time of trial.
- As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of DEFENDANT, 32. PLAINTIFF has suffered great bodily injury, pain and suffering, humiliation, fear and degradation.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

2

Municipal Liability for Unconstitutional Custom or Policy (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

3 4 (Against Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS)

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

33. PLAINTIFF repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through32 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

- On and for some time prior to February 16, 2009 (and continuing to the 34. present date) Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS, deprived PLAINTIFF, of the rights and liberties secured to him by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, in that said defendants and their supervising and managerial employees, agents, and representatives, acting with gross negligence and with reckless and deliberate indifference to the rights and liberties of the public in general, and of PLAINTIFF, and of persons in their class, situation and comparable position in particular, knowingly maintained, enforced and applied an official recognized COUNTY custom, policy, and practice of:
 - Employing and retaining as police officers and other personnel, (a) including DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, who Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS at all times material herein knew or reasonably should have known had dangerous propensities for abusing their authority by using excessive force and denying medical care, and for mistreating citizens by failing to follow written COUNTY Sheriff's Department and county detention policies;
 - Of inadequately supervising, training, controlling, assigning, and (b) disciplining COUNTY Police Officers, and other COUNTY personnel, including DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, who

Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS each knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known had the aforementioned propensities and character traits;

- (c) By maintaining grossly inadequate procedures for reporting, supervising, investigating, reviewing, disciplining and controlling the intentional misconduct by Defendants DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, who are COUNTY employees;
- (d) By failing to adequately train officers, including Defendants
 DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or
 CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, and failing to institute appropriate
 policies, regarding constitutional procedures and practices for
 use of force; and
- (d) By having and maintaining an unconstitutional custom and practice of detaining and arresting individuals without probable cause or reasonable suspicion, using excessive force, including deadly force, failing to obtain medical care, depriving persons of life, liberty, and property so as to shock the conscience, conspiring to violate civil rights, and conspiring to cover-up civil rights violations, which is also demonstrated by inadequate training regarding these subjects. The customs and practices of COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS were done with a deliberate indifference to individuals' safety and rights.
- 35. By reason of the aforementioned policies and practices of Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS, PLAINTIFF was severely injured and subjected to pain and suffering. PLAINTIFF also suffered humiliation, fear and degradation.

- Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS, together with 36. various other officials, whether named or unnamed, had either actual or constructive knowledge of the deficient policies, practices and customs alleged in the paragraphs above. Despite having knowledge as stated above these defendants condoned, tolerated and through actions and inactions thereby ratified such policies. Said defendants also acted with deliberate indifference to the foreseeable effects and consequences of these policies with respect to the constitutional rights of PLAINTIFF, and other individuals similarly situated.
- By perpetrating, sanctioning, tolerating and ratifying the outrageous 37. conduct and other wrongful acts, Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS acted with an intentional, reckless, and callous disregard toward PLAINTIFF, and of the constitutional as well as human rights of PLAINTIFF. Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS and each of their actions were willful, wanton, oppressive, malicious, fraudulent, and extremely offensive and unconscionable to any person of normal sensibilities.
- 38. Furthermore, the policies, practices, and customs implemented and maintained and still tolerated by Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS were affirmatively linked to and were a significantly influential force behind the injuries of PLAINTIFF.
- Accordingly, Defendants COUNTY and DOE SUPERVISORS each are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

26

27

FOUTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

2

Battery (Cal. Govt. Code § 820 and California Common Law)

3

(Against DOE OFFICERS and COUNTY)

5 6

4

40. PLAINTIFF repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 39 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

7

41. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, while working as Sherriff's Deputies for the COUNTY

9

8

Sherriff's Department and employees of Twin Towers Detention Facility, and acting

10

within the course and scope of their duties, intentionally assaulted PLAINTIFF. As a result, PLAINTIFF suffered serious injuries. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY

11 12

SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS had no legal justification for

their actions, and said defendants' use of force against PLAINTIFF while carrying

out their duties as deputy sheriffs and as COUNTY employees was an unreasonable

15

16

17

18

use of force.

As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct as alleged 42. above, PLAINTIFF was caused to suffer severe pain and suffering. PLAINTIFF also suffered humiliation, fear and degradation.

19

20

21

43. COUNTY is vicariously liable for DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS's wrongful acts pursuant to section 815.2 of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is liable for the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if the employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

22 23

24

25

44. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS's conduct was malicious, wanton, oppressive, and accomplished with a conscious disregard for the rights of PLAINTIFF, entitling Plaintiff to an award of exemplary and punitive damages.

26 27

1 FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 2 Negligence (Cal. Govt. Code § 820 and California Common Law) 3 (Against All Defendants) PLAINTIFF repeats and realleges each and every allegation in 45. 4 5 paragraphs 1 through 44 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein. 6 46. 7 The actions of DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS and DOE SUPERVISORS toward PLAINTIFF 8 were negligent and reckless, including but not limited to: the failure to properly and adequately assess the need to detain, 10 (a) arrest, and use force or deadly force against PLAINTIFF; 11 12 (b) the failure to monitor and record any use of force by COUNTY 13 Sheriff's Deputies and employees of Twin Towers Detention Facility, including DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY 14 SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS; 15 16 (c) the failure to monitor and record any injuries specifically caused by the use of force by COUNTY Sheriff's Deputies and 17 employees of Twin Towers Detention Facility, including DOE 18 19 OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or 20 **CUSTODY ASSISTANTS:** the negligent tactics and handling of the situation with 21 (d) PLAINTIFF; 22 the negligent detention, arrest, and use of force including deadly 23 (e) 24 force against PLAINTIFF; (f) the failure to properly train and supervise employees, both 25 profession and non-professional, including DOE OFFICERS 26 and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY 27 28 ASSISTANTS;

- 51. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS, while working as Sheriff's Deputies for the COUNTY Sheriff's Department and employees of Twin Towers Detention Facility, and acting within the course and scope of their duties, engaged in conduct that was outrageous, including but not limited to:
 - (a) Using excessive force against PLAINTIFF, who was not resisting arrest, posed no safety threat, and had not committed any crime;
 - (b) Failing to summon medical assistance for PLAINTIFF; and
 - (c) Ignoring or concealing evidence of the unjustified use of force and taking steps to cover-up the wrongful conduct;
- 52. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS abused a position of authority over PLAINTIFF, and knew that their conduct would likely result in harm due to mental distress.
- 53. DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS intended to cause PLAINTIFF severe emotional distress, or acted with reckless disregard of the probability that PLAINTIFF would suffer emotional distress.
- 54. PLAINTIFF suffered severe emotional distress, including suffering, anguish, fright, horror, nervousness, grief, worry, shock, humiliation, and shame.
- 55. The conduct of DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS was a substantial factor in causing the severe emotional distress of PLAINTIFF.
- 56. COUNTY is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of DOE OFFICERS and/or CUSTODY SPECIALISTS, and/or CUSTODY ASSISTANTS pursuant to section 815.2 of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is liable for the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if the employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury. DATED: April 13, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO By Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Otis D. Wright II and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Ralph Zarefsky.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 2728 ODW (RZx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

Α	Il discovery related motions	shou	ald be noticed on the calendar	of the	e Magistrate Judge
			NOTICE TO COUNSEL		
	py of this notice must be served w a copy of this notice must be sen		e summons and complaint on all del n all plaintiffs).	endar	nts (if a removal action is
Sub	sequent documents must be filed a	at the	following location:		
[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	П	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	П	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

SERGE LAPOINTE, an individual

Plaintiff

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 1 through

10, inclusive,

Defendant

CV10 - 0272807-(R2x)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive.

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,

whose name and address are:

Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo

Dale K. Galipo, Esq.

21800 Burbank Boulevard - Suite 310

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Telephone (818) 347-3333 / Facsimile (818) 347-4118

EMail: dalekgalipo@yahoo.com

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: 4/14/2010

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AMY GRAGERA

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (nam	e of individual and title, if any)										
was re	ceived by me on (date)	•										
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(place)									
			on (date)	; or								
	☐ I left the summons a	I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)										
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,											
	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or											
	☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, who is								
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)											
			on (date)	_ ; or								
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or								
	☐ Other (specify):											
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00								
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information i	s true.									
Date:												
			Server's signature									
			Printed name and title	4								
			Server's address									

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 2:10-ENITED2ST-ATES/DRSTRICT: GOVERT 1CENTRAD ADISTRICT PAGGALBROIRDA Page ID #:18 CIVIL COVER SHEET

CIVIL COVER SHEET													
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) SERGE LAPOINTE					EFENDA COUNT	NTS Y OF LOS A	NGEL	ES					
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES						Y OF LOS A	ANGEL	ES					
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing						f Known)	*****				7		, ,
yourself, provide same.)	0.55	ADJ. W. O. H. Areas	ъ.		Unknown	ı							
Dale K. Galipo, Esq., Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo, 21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310, Woodland Hills, CA 91367 (818) 347-3333 / dalekgalipo@yahoo.com									-				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)													
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	z 3	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizen of This St	ate		PTF M 1		Incorporated or Proof Business in this			TF] 4	DEF □ 4
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	□ 4	Diversity (Indicate Citize of Parties in Item III)	nship	Citizen of Anothe	r State		□2	□2	Incorporated and I of Business in And			3 5	□ 5
				Citizen or Subject	of a Forei	gn Country	□ 3	□ 3	Foreign Nation			16	□ 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one	e box or	ıly.)			-								
☐ Original ☐ 2 Removed from ☐ 3 Remanded from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify): ☐ 6 Multipation ☐ 7 Appeal to District District Judge from Litigation Magistrate Judge													
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLA	AINT:	JURY DEMAND: Y	es 🗆	No (Check 'Yes'	only if den	nanded in co	mplain	t.)					
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23:	□ Yes ■No		M	ONEY DI	EMANDED	IN CO	MPLA	INT: \$ According	g to Proc	of		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite													
(1) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Excessive Fo		445.4		U.S.C. § 1983 Equ Infliction of Emo			J.S.C. §	1983 M	funicipal Liability;	(4) Batte	ry; (5) N	eglig	gence
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place							KNAMATI INDICATO	******	Management and the second seco			Annes	
OTHER STATUTES	200200000000000000000000000000000000000	CONTRACT Insurance	15 (200) (300)	TORTS SONAL INJURY		TORTS ERSONAL		500 000 000 000	RISONER ETITIONS	The second secon	LABO	CAD a se	
K)	1			Airplane		ROPERTY			Motions to	□710 F	air Labo Act	r Sta	ndards
☐ 430 Banks and Banking			□ 315	Airplane Product	1	Other Frau			Vacate Sentence	□ 720 L	abor/M	gmt.	
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC		Negotiable Instrument Recovery of	□ 320	Liability Assault, Libel &		Truth in Le			Habeas Corpus		Relations		
Rates/etc.	П 130	Overpayment &		Slander	LI 380				General Death Penalty	□ 730 L	.abor/M(Reporting		
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced		Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employers'	□ 385				Mandamus/		Disclosu	-	t
and Corrupt		Judgment	□ 340	Liability Marine		Product Lia		<u></u>		□ 740 F	•		r Act
Organizations	1	Medicare Act Recovery of Defaulted	345			NKRUPIC Appeal 28			Civil Rights	□ 7 90 (
☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	132	Student Loan (Excl.	- 250	Liability	422	158	USC		Prison Condition REFITURE	□ 791 E	Litigation		
□ 810 Selective Service		Veterans)	□ 350 □ 355		□ 423	Withdrawa	1 28		PENALTY	S	Security	Act	
□ 850 Securities/Commodities/	□ 153		- 555	Product Liability		USC 157			Agriculture	PRO			HTS
Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12		Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal	,	VIL RIGHT Voting	(2)	□ 620	Other Food & Drug	□ 820 (□ 830 H		its	
USC 3410	□ 160	Stockholders' Suits	□ 362	Injury Personal Injury-		Employme	nt	□ 625	Drug Related	□ 840 T		rk	
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	□ 190	Other Contract	J 502	Med Malpractice	l	Housing/A		l	Seizure of	SOC	IAL SE	CUR	
□ 891 Agricultural Act	□ 195	Contract Product	□ 365	Personal Injury-	- L	mmodation	ıs	1	Property 21 USC				
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	T 196	Liability Franchise	□ 368	Product Liability Asbestos Persona		Welfare American	with	III 630	881 Liquor Laws	□ 862 1 □ 863 1		•	,
☐ 893 Environmental Matters		REAL PROPERTY	300	Injury Product	1 1 443	Disabilities			R.R. & Truck		(405(g))	17 AA A	v
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	□210	Land Condemnation	-	Liability		Employme	nt	□ 650	Airline Regs	□ 864		le X	Vl
□ 895 Freedom of Info. Act	220	Foreclosure		MMIGRATION	□ 446	American		□ 660	Occupational		RSI (405		
☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- nation Under Equal		Rent Lease & Ejectment Torts to Land	402	Application		Disabilities Other	s -	□ 690	Safety /Health Other		RAL T. Taxes (U		
Access to Justice		Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Habeas Corpus-	₩ 440	Other Civi	1		Culoi		or Defen		
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	3	All Other Real Property	□ 465	Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions		Rights				□ 871 I		rd Pa	,
	<u> </u>												

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Case 2:10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT PEGALIFORNIA Page ID #:19

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has f yes, list case number(s):	this action been pre	eviously filed in this court and	d dismissed, remanded or closed? ▼No □ Yes				
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	any cases been pre-	viously filed in this court that	are related to the present case? VNo 🗆 Yes				
□ C. I	Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we	or closely related transaction on of the same or substantially ould entail substantial duplica	ns, happenings, or events; or y related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or <u>and</u> one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.				
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following informati	on, use an additional sheet if	necessary.)				
			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
Plaintiff - County of Los Angele:	3						
			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. f this box is checked, go to item (c).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
Defendant - County of Los Ange	eles						
(c) List the County in this District; (Note: In land condemnation cs			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. ved. California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
County of Los Angeles							
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, Ve the location of the	entura, Santa Barbara, or S tract of land involved	Sent Juis Objeto Counties				
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	////	Date 04/14/2010				
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law	ne CV-71 (JS-44) Cov. This form, approv	ved by the Judicial Conferenc	rmation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings to of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)				
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	ocial Security Cases						
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	f Cause of Action				
861	НІА		rance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. ospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the SFF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of I (30 U.S.C. 923)					
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
864	SSID	All claims for supplement Act, as amended.	tal security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))					

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2